## STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2002-03

# Danbury School District WILLIAM GLASS, Superintendent

Telephone: 203-797-4701



This profile was produced by the Connecticut State Department of Education in accordance with CT General Statutes 10-220(c).

## **COMMUNITY DATA**

County: FAIRFIELD Public School Enrollment as a Percent of Town Population: 12.5% 2000 Population: 74,848 Public School Enrollment as % of Total Student Population: 85.4% 1990-2000 Population Growth: 14.1% Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000: 23.2% 2000 Per Capita Income: \$24,500 Adult Education Enrollment in 2001-02 School Year: 1,120 Number of Public Schools: 17 Number of Adults Receiving Diplomas in 2001-02 School Yr.: 118

Number of Nonpublic Schools: 11

Education Reference Group (ERG): H ERG is a classification of districts whose students' families are similar in education, income, occupation, and need, and that have roughly similar enrollment.

# **DISTRICT NEED**

<b>Current and Past District Need</b>	Year	District	ERG	State
% of Students Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Meals	2002-03	38.3	35.0	25.4
% of K-12 Students with Non-English Home	2002-03	22.9	19.1	12.2
Language	1998-99	29.2	16.8	12.3
% of Elementary and Middle School Students who	2002-03	83.9	85.4	87.5
Attended the Same School the Previous Year	1997-98	86.4	83.0	85.2
% of Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool,	2002-03	70.1	74.3	75.9
Nursery School, or Headstart	1997-98	62.5	68.7	70.4
% of Juniors and Seniors Working More Than 16	2002-03	48.9	30.0	25.7
Hours Per Week	1997-98	44.8	32.4	30.3

# STUDENT ENROLLMENT AND RACE/ETHNICITY

Enrollment		Race/Ethnicity (Jan.)	Number	Percent
Grade Range	PK-12	American Indian	12	0.1
Total January Enrollment	9,505	Asian American	744	7.8
5-Year Oct. Enrollment Change	8.1%	Black	1,010	10.6
Projected Oct. 2007 Enrollment		Hispanic	2,201	23.2
Elementary	4,360	White	5,530	58.2
Middle School	2,215	Other	8	0.1
High School	2,669	Total Minority 2002-03	3,975	41.8
Prekindergarten, Other	323	Total Minority 1997-98	3,616	40.9

#### EFFORTS TO REDUCE RACIAL, ETHNIC, AND ECONOMIC ISOLATION

Connecticut law requires that school districts provide educational opportunities for its students to interact with students and teachers from diverse racial, ethnic, and economic backgrounds. This may occur through magnet school programs, public school choice programs, charter schools, minority staff recruitment, inter- or intradistrict programs and projects, distance learning, or other experiences. Below is the description submitted by this school district of how it provides such experiences.

Danbury Public Schools is perhaps one of the best racial, ethnic, and economically balanced districts in the State. The community celebrates its diversity and works hard to ensure its schools are meeting the needs of all its students. We have two ESL Reception Centers that welcome our non-English speaking students and help their parents adjust to our schools' culture. We also work closely with community groups such as the Hispanic Center and other groups to assist parents and students in mastering the transition to the Danbury Public Schools.

We anticipate that the design and construction of a Magnet School on the Western CT State University campus will begin in the spring of 2004; and the Magnet School is expected to open in the fall of 2004. This K-5 magnet school will serve students from throughout the Greater Danbury Area. It will mirror the diversity of the Danbury Public Schools. The theme of the school will be around dual language with an international focus. In addition, our school will work closely with surrounding communities in a host of student exchange programs.

The District continues to work at improving its percentage of minority employees. Over the past three years, our average of minority representation exceeded 11.5%.

## **DISTRICT RESOURCES**

Staff Count (Full-Time Equivalent)	*
# of Certified Staff	
Teachers	661.0
Administrators	47.0
Library/Media Staff	21.0
Other Professionals	75.9
% Minority 2002-03	7.4
% Minority 1997-98	6.6
# Non-Certified Instructional	142.0

Average C	Class Size	District	ERG	State
Grade K	2002-03	17.6	18.7	18.3
	1997-98	18.1	19.2	19.0
Grade 2	2002-03	18.6	19.5	19.5
	1997-98	19.8	20.0	20.5
Grade 5	2002-03	21.6	21.0	21.6
	1997-98	21.9	21.5	21.6
Grade 7	2002-03	30.5	22.5	21.7
	1997-98	24.3	23.5	21.9
High	2002-03	23.4	21.2	20.1
School	1997-98	20.6	21.8	20.1

Professional Staff Experience and Training	District	ERG	State
Average Number of Years Experience in Connecticut	15.3	14.2	13.5
% with Master's Degree or Above	77.6	79.1	77.8
% Trained as Mentors, Assessors, or Cooperating Teachers	22.5	21.9	25.0

# **DISTRICT RESOURCES, continued**

Total Hours of Instruction Per Yr.*	Dist	ERG	State
Elementary	966	984	986
Middle School	998	1,014	1,006
High School	963	994	1,000

*State law requires at least 900 hours for gr. 1-12 and full-
day kindergarten, and 450 hours for half-day kindergarten.

Resource Ratios	District	ERG	State
Students Per Academic Computer	3.9	4.3	4.0
Students Per Teacher	14.5	13.9	13.7
Teachers Per Administrator	14.1	14.6	13.8

Page 3

# STUDENT PERFORMANCE









Physical Fitness	District	ERG	State
% Passing All 4 Tests	29.5	28.0	34.8

Connecticut Mastery Test, Third Generation, % Meeting State Goal: The state goal was established with the advice and assistance of a cross section of Connecticut educators. The Goal level is more demanding than the state Proficient level, but not as high as the Advanced level, reported in the No Child Left Behind Report Cards.

II	cut Mastery Test, 3 <sup>rd</sup> Gen. ng State Goal	District 2000-01	District 2002-03	ERG 2002-03	State 2002-03
Grade 4	Reading	44	44.9	46.8	55.9
	Writing	49	50.1	55.3	61.5
	Mathematics	60	61.4	53.6	60.4
	All Three Tests	33.0	33.7	34.5	42.1
Grade 6	Reading	52	53.3	53.5	64.1
	Writing	46	38.6	49.1	60.8
	Mathematics	52	59.1	49.5	61.0
	All Three Tests	32.8	31.9	33.3	46.2
Grade 8	Reading	56	56.3	57.4	68.1
	Writing	52	49.0	48.5	60.0
	Mathematics	41	39.2	42.4	56.1
	All Three Tests	31.5	30.0	31.8	45.2
Participat	ion Rate	88.2	94.8	96.1	96.5



The figures above were calculated differently than those reported in the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Report Cards. Unlike NCLB figures, these results reflect the performance of students with scoreable tests who were enrolled in the district at the time of testing, regardless of the length of time they were enrolled in the district.

# STUDENT PERFORMANCE, continued

Connecticut Academic Performance Test, Second Generation, % Meeting State Goal: The state Goal was established with the advice and assistance of a cross section of Connecticut educators. Students receive certification of mastery for each area in which they meet or exceed the Goal. The Goal level is more demanding than the state Proficient level, but not as high as the Advanced level, reported in the No Child Left Behind Report Cards.

Conn. Academic Performance Test, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Gen. % Grade 10 Meeting State Goal	District 2000-01	District 2002-03	ERG 2002-03	State 2002-03
Reading Across the Disciplines	31	42.4	37.0	47.0
Writing Across the Disciplines	45	50.8	44.4	52.8
Mathematics	36	30.4	33.8	45.1
Science	37	32.9	31.7	43.2
All Four Tests	14.3	17.4	17.2	26.6
Participation Rate	80.7	91.1	91.0	93.2



The figures above were calculated differently than those reported in the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Report Cards. Unlike NCLB figures, these results reflect the performance of students with scoreable tests who were enrolled in the district at the time of testing, regardless of the length of time they were enrolled in the district.

SAT® I: Reasoning Test	Class of 1997			
	District	District	ERG	State
% of Graduates Tested	65.8	78.1	70.6	76.8
Mathematics: Average Score	477	477	479	503
Mathematics: % Scoring 600 or More	14.3	15.4	15.5	22.3
Verbal: Average Score	483	480	479	502
Verbal: % Scoring 600 or More	11.9	14.7	14.5	20.4

Dropout Rates	District	ERG	State
Cumulative Four-Year Rate for Class of 2002	14.5	13.1	10.8
2001-02 Annual Rate for Grades 9 through 12	3.8	3.0	2.4
1996-97 Annual Rate for Grades 9 through 12	5.1	4.7	3.9

Activities of	Graduates	Class of	# in District	District %	ERG %	State %
_	Pursuing Higher	2002	434	85.8	79.2	79.7
<b>1</b> 1	Education	1997	364	81.5	74.1	75.6
<b>7</b> 4.	Employed or in	2002	69	13.6	18.0	16.3
Military	Military	1997	59	13.2	18.6	18.6
	Unemployed	2002	0	0.0	1.2	0.9
		1997	18	4.0	1.9	1.4

34-00 Page 5

Expenditures may be supported by local tax revenues, state grants, federal grants, municipal in-kind services, tuition and other sources. ERG and state figures will not be comparable to the district if the school district does not teach both elementary and secondary students.

Expenditures	Total	Expenditures Per Pupil			
All figures are unaudited.	(in 1000s)	District	PK-12 Districts	ERG	State
Instructional Staff and Services	\$53,922	\$5,636	\$5,790	\$5,958	\$5,786
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$2,476	\$259	\$254	\$216	\$256
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$3,953	\$413	\$383	\$349	\$376
Student Support Services	\$5,991	\$626	\$548	\$538	\$544
Administration and Support Services	\$7,296	\$763	\$997	\$965	\$1,006
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$6,735	\$704	\$946	\$854	\$938
Transportation	\$4,113	\$400	\$446	\$438	\$445
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$1,398	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$765	\$80	\$119	\$76	\$117
Total	\$86,648	\$9,007	\$9,703	\$9,622	\$9,663
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$5,214	\$545	\$1,025	\$811	\$1,059
Adult Education	\$301	\$244	N/A	\$637	\$776

**Revenue Sources, % from Source.** Revenue sources do not include state funded Teachers' Retirement Board contributions, vocational-technical school operations, SDE budgeted costs for salaries and leadership activities and other state-funded school districts (e.g., Dept. of Children and Families and Dept. of Corrections).

District Expenditures Local Revenue		State Revenue	Federal Revenue	Tuition & Other	
With School Construction	70.3	24.0	5.1	0.6	
Without School Construction	71.7	22.2	5.5	0.6	

Selected Regular Education Expenditures, Amount Per Pupil and Percent Change from Prior Year. Selected regular education expenditures exclude costs of special education and land, building, and debt service.

<b>Expenditures by Grade</b>	District		ERG		State	
Level	Per Pupil	% Change	Per Pupil	% Change	Per Pupil	% Change
Elementary and Middle						
Total	\$6,761	-10.3	\$7,930	2.8	\$8,015	4.5
Salaries and Benefits	\$5,521	-11.1	\$6,681	4.3	\$6,589	5.2
Supplies	\$219	-6.8	\$365	-7.8	\$425	-1.2
Equipment	\$370	-31.0	\$136	-14.5	\$130	-6.5
High School						
Total	\$10,415	30.2	\$8,928	5.7	\$8,899	3.7
Salaries and Benefits	\$9,187	41.3	\$7,455	6.4	\$7,142	3.9
Supplies	\$283	-20.5	\$455	6.1	\$495	-3.1
Equipment	\$374	-17.4	\$188	8.0	\$173	4.2

#### EQUITABLE ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES AMONG DISTRICT SCHOOLS

Below is the description submitted by this district of how it allocates resources to insure equity and address needs.

The Board of Education ensures that each school within the school district receives a base level of support for personnel and instructional supplies.

Student enrollment and class size determine the base level of funding for personnel. Support levels for instructional supplies are also based on an allocation per student. The Central Office then determines what additional personnel and instructional supplies are required for schools with specific needs or programs in addition to the base level of support. Overall the criteria for determining budgets are the student enrollment and program needs.

In addition, budgets for the maintenance of our facilities and the purchase of equipment are evaluated at the Central Office and budget commitments are made based on needs and program. In recent years we also have made good use of the State Facilities Grant to improve the overall appearance of all of our schools.

The District also receives a significant amount of funding as a Priority School District. These funds and other grants are allocated in keeping with the goals and objectives of the various grants.

## EVIDENCE OF SUSTAINED IMPROVEMENTS IN STUDENT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Below is a summary, submitted by this school district, of the major trends in student performance and accomplishments that indicate sustained improvement over time. Also, areas of need are identified and plans to address these needs are presented.

#### Connecticut Mastery Test

· Results of the 2002 CMT3 for combined grades 4-6-8 show substantial growth in Reading, and Writing with stable results in Math. Overall, all areas are above state goals.

#### Connecticut Academic Performance Test

Results of the 2003 CAPT shows that scores have gone up an average of 4% in the 3 areas of testing of Science, Reading and Writing. Math shows a drop of 1%. Overall all areas are substantially above the state goals.

Strategic School Profiles may be viewed on the internet at **www.state.ct.us/sde**. A more detailed, searchable SSP database, data tables, and additional CT education facts are also available at this site.